# COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

#### FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 5325-01 <u>Bill No.</u>: HB 1982

Subject: Landlords and Tenants; Courts; Crimes and Punishment

Type: Original

<u>Date</u>: April 17, 2014

Bill Summary: This proposal changes the laws regarding landlord-tenant actions.

### **FISCAL SUMMARY**

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

L.R. No. 5325-01 Bill No. HB 1982 Page 2 of 5 April 17, 2014

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)					
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2015 FY 2016 FY 20				
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0		

- ☐ Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).
- ☐ Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	
<b>Local Government</b>	\$0	\$0	\$0	

#### **FISCAL ANALYSIS**

#### **ASSUMPTION**

Officials at the **Department of Corrections (DOC)** assume the penalty provisions are for up to a class D felony. Currently, the DOC cannot predict the number of new commitments which may result from the creation of the offense(s) outlined in this proposal. An increase in commitments depends on the utilization by prosecutors and the actual sentences imposed by the courts.

If additional persons are sentenced to the custody of the DOC due to the provisions of this legislation, the DOC will incur a corresponding increase of direct offender costs either through incarceration (FY13 average of \$18.014 per offender, per day, or an annual cost of \$6,575 per inmate) or through supervision provided by the Board of Probation and Parole (FY13 average of \$5.07 per offender, per day or an annual cost of \$1,851 per offender).

The following factors contribute to DOC's minimal assumption:

- 1.) DOC assumes the narrow scope of the crime will not encompass a large number of offenders.
- 2.) The low felony status of the crime enhances the possibility of plea-bargaining or imposition of a probation sentence.
- 3.) The probability exists that offenders would be charged with a similar but more serious offense or that sentences may run concurrent to one another.

In summary, supervision by the DOC through probation or incarceration would result in some additional costs, but it is assumed the impact would be \$0 or a minimal amount that could be absorbed within existing resources.

For the purpose of this proposed legislation, and as a result of excessive caseloads, the **Office of State Public Defender (SPD)** cannot assume existing staff will provide competent, effective representation for any new cases where indigent persons are charged with the proposed new crime of intentional destruction of rental property a new class B misdemeanor. Intentional destruction of rental property with damages of seven hundred fifty dollars or greater is a class D felony.

While the number of new cases may be too few or uncertain to request additional funding for this specific bill, the SPD will continue to request sufficient appropriations to provide competent and effective representation in all cases where the right to counsel attaches.

**Oversight** assumes the SPD can absorb the additional caseload that may result from this proposal.

Officials at the **Office of Prosecution Services** assume no fiscal impact from this proposal. The creation of a new crime creates additional responsibilities for county prosecutors which may in turn result in additional costs which are difficult to determine.

Officials at the **Office of the State Courts Administrator** assume no fiscal impact from this proposal.

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2015 (10 Mo.)	FY 2016	FY 2017
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2015 (10 Mo.)	FY 2016	FY 2017
	<u><b>\$0</b></u>	<u><b>\$0</b></u>	<u><b>\$0</b></u>

#### FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

#### FISCAL DESCRIPTION

The proposed legislation appears to have no direct fiscal impact.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

L.R. No. 5325-01 Bill No. HB 1982 Page 5 of 5 April 17, 2014

## **SOURCES OF INFORMATION**

Department of Corrections
Office of the State Public Defender
Office of Prosecution Services
Office of the State Courts Administrator

Mickey Wilson, CPA

Mickey Wilen

Director April 17, 2014

Ross Strope Assistant Director April 17, 2014